

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective February 1, 1962, there is hereby authorized to be paid from the Contingent Fund of the House of Representatives, such sum as may be necessary to pay the salary of a Research Specialist, Office of Coordinator of Information, at the Basic Rate of \$2,180 per annum until June 30, 1962.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 75 of April 17 I am recorded as being absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 6 I am recorded as being absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I was called away on official business and failed to respond to the rollcall. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 205) to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement see proceedings of the House of April 16, 1962.)

Mr. HARRIS (interrupting reading of conference report). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement of the managers be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if he is going to explain this conference report?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I intend to take a little time to explain the report and the provisions of it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this conference report brings to a culmination long efforts to bring about the construc-

tion of additional educational television stations and that will encourage the utilization of a highly important natural resource, the radio spectrum, insofar as radiofrequencies are assigned for educational purposes.

The conference report itself is very explicit. There were some substantial differences between the House bill and the Senate bill, but the conferees have worked together and we feel we have brought back a very good bill. Some of the questions that were raised in the House have been covered, and I will take a minute to discuss them very briefly.

First, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, as I understand this conference report, in substance what has been done is to restore to the bill the provision stricken out in the House that would provide for nonprofit educational organizations to be recognized and to be licensed.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct. But I will say further that it does tighten and clarify that provision of this legislation to do what the gentleman from Michigan had in mind, in my judgment, at the time he offered his amendment. We have made it very clear and explicit that those organizations he referred to, and which other Members of the House referred to should not be permitted to come under the program. They are excluded. Those that were excluded unintentionally I think are now included and are eligible under this program.

Mr. BROWN. If I understand correctly, any nonprofit organization—in some States it takes only three incorporators and \$10 to incorporate a nonprofit organization—incorporated for educational purposes would qualify under FCC so-called restrictions we have heard so much about. There is an organization called the Committee of Political Education—COPE, as it is sometimes used—and that organization, as I understand it, is a nonprofit organization, so recognized under the law for tax purposes as an educational organization. Could that organization, under the provisions of this bill as it is brought back to us, qualify to take the air and educate the public on political matters or on any other matters?

Mr. HARRIS. It would not be eligible and could not participate.

Mr. BROWN. Explain why not.

Mr. HARRIS. Because the conference report provides in section 392(b) as follows: "a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association, which is organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting and is eligible to receive a license from the FCC for a noncommercial educational television broadcasting station pursuant to the rules and regulations of the Commission in effect on April 12, 1962."

Then on page 8 of the conference report, in the statement of the managers, we set out what those Commission rules are. Therefore, it is clear and explicit that an organization such as the gentleman has suggested would not be eligible.

Mr. BROWN. The gentleman is absolutely certain that under those circum-

stances that particular organization or any organization of that type could not qualify for one of these licenses?

Mr. HARRIS. I am certain of it. And, I may say categorically to the gentleman that is the type of organization that would not be eligible.

Mr. BROWN. Or any other group of three citizens going out and incorporating as an educational institution, claiming it was strictly for educational purposes? Maybe they would want to promote the idea to the people that the moon is made of green cheese, and under a lot of court decisions that could be held to be an educational program.

Mr. HARRIS. I will say to the gentleman, in the first place they would have to meet the criteria under section 392 (a), paragraphs 1, 2, 3, and 4. Then, in addition to that, they have got to meet the criteria of an association of nonprofit community organizations chartered by a State to engage in noncommercial educational broadcasting. In other words, they have got to meet these criteria to be eligible. Such groups—and here is the crux of it—such groups must be broadly representative of the educational, cultural, and civic groups in the community.

Mr. BROWN. In other words, what you are saying is that the Federal Communications Commission in its great, innate wisdom, will decide what education is, what culture is, and all of these other activities. You and I know that the members of the Commission are only human, after all; they are not demagogues, and sometimes we see different types of men serving on different commissions, with the result that we have different views on these matters quite often. In other words, you feel—and I ask this question because I have great confidence in the gentleman and I have served on his great committee—

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN. Both as an expert and as an attorney that this bill will protect the American people from these so-called special incorporated nonprofit organizations that are set up for some particular purpose or other which they may claim is to educate the listeners but that you and I might agree was not for educational purposes?

Mr. HARRIS. Three things I would like to say in response to the gentleman in order to try to make it as definite as possible that the gentleman is correct: No. 1, they have got to be an organization established for educational television purposes; No. 2, they cannot be fly-by-nights.

Mr. BROWN. If you will just pause there, of course, the question of what an educational purpose is might be a matter of discretion.

Mr. HARRIS. Well, let me read you what it says.

Mr. BROWN. I have read it.

Mr. HARRIS. It helps to make the record.

A single nonprofit organization, unless it were an accredited educational organization or tax-supported cultural organization, would not be considered eligible to receive a license for a noncommercial educational television reservation. And,

I want to make it very clear here and now that it is the intention that this would be congressional policy, and it is the intention of the Congress that the Federal Communications Commission and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare carry out this policy. If anyone comes in and attempts to get a license or a grant who is not eligible under these rules, then they are to see that the congressional intent is carried out.

Mr. BROWN. Now, I am sure the gentleman from Arkansas, brilliant as he is, knows that the reason why I asked these questions is to well define the legislative history on this bill so that there can be no question arise in the future about it; where the courts, at least, will know what the intent and the purpose of the Congress is, if we have people on the bench who can read the English language.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman for making this legislative history as clear as possible and that he will go along with the conference report.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, since I offered the amendment on the floor, which was a source of some controversy concerning this legislation, I should like to take a few moments to comment upon the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, we should be aware, of course, that in this legislation we are providing a measure and a kind of Federal aid to education. In a sense, we should look at this legislation as we would view a bill to build classrooms for educational institutions, because this bill authorizes the use of Federal funds to finance the construction of educational facilities.

The crucial issue is: To whom should Federal funds be made available for educational purposes?

If my amendment was too restrictive as it was offered, let me say that, in my opinion, the language of the bill on this point, as it was brought to the floor from the committee, was much too broad and all-inclusive.

In the course of the conference, I think the conferees have agreed upon better, more precise language which provides at least some limitation as to the groups and associations that will be considered as "educational" for the purposes of this bill.

The gentleman from California, [Mr. Moss], who made a very good statement when the bill was on the floor earlier, might be inclined to say now: "We said then that the FCC must determine who will get a license to operate an educational TV station." But the conferees have improved the legislation in this respect. They have adopted criteria and standards by referring to specific FCC regulations as of a particular date; and the FCC will not be able to change those standards tomorrow or next week.

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Arkan-

sas [Mr. HARRIS], has said, in order to qualify for assistance under this legislation an applicant must be an educational institution, or tax-supported cultural organization, or a subdivision of government, or a nonprofit association organized for educational purposes that is chartered by the State.

I would still prefer that the assistance be limited to regularly accredited and recognized educational institutions. However, under the conference agreement an educational association must be State chartered to qualify. Accordingly, the ultimate determination and control as to what is an "educational" association will rest with the State.

I think the language adopted by the conferees is an improvement and I shall not oppose the conference report.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Let me say that I would like to compliment the gentleman for his interest in this matter, and the contribution he has made to this very important and worthwhile program.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman who is a member of the committee.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] just said. But I would say to the House of Representatives that his judgment in this matter has been of little assistance so far. As I recall, the last time the distinguished gentleman from Michigan offered an amendment and commented on the subject of educational TV, he got in a great deal of difficulty. As I recall, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan's amendment knocked out one educational TV facility in Michigan under the provision of this bill. So I would say that the gentleman's comments are singularly of little value to the House of Representatives today.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when the bill was up for debate on the House floor, the chairman mentioned a number of broadly based community supported television stations, including the Metropolitan Pittsburgh educational television station, WQED. I would like to ask the gentleman on behalf of my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] whether a station like WQED would qualify under the conference report?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] also a few minutes ago inquired about the same station as the gentleman now is inquiring about, and the answer is "yes, they would be qualified."

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Could this in any way lead

to pressure to provide tax support for more cultural organizations in order to provide all of the qualifications for the establishment of a broadcasting facility?

Mr. HARRIS. I do not view it in that light; no.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, one of the provisions is to the effect that they be a tax-supported, cultural organization. Is that not true?

Mr. HARRIS. That is one of the provisions under the legislation and under the regulations.

Mr. GROSS. I hope we do not get a deluge here of organizations of one kind or another asking for Federal tax support.

Mr. HARRIS. This is a limited program. I think a great many people who are interested in promoting educational television overlook one thing and that is that the purpose of this legislation is not primarily to broaden the educational programs in various areas. The primary purpose here is to utilize a natural resource—the radio spectrum—that is not being utilized so that those who are engaged in education may have the benefit of this natural resource. We are interested in this resource being utilized for the benefit of the public. That is the primary purpose of this legislation.

The House provided a limitation of \$25 million. The other body provided for \$50 million. Both the House bill and the Senate bill provided a limitation of \$1 million for facilities in any one State. That limitation is still included, naturally. We did compromise on the amount. We agreed to a limitation of \$32 million in the program. The other body accepted the House requirement of matching grants of 50 percent—50 percent to be supplied by the applicant except where there is a facility that has already been constructed. There they will be given a 25-percent credit toward their future facilities for the amount already expended by the organization.

We placed a limitation of 15 percent on the amount that could be used for microwave relays and similar facilities used to interconnect two or more broadcasting stations.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment this is a most important step that we are taking toward encouraging local people to utilize this natural resource that we have for educational purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] who is unable to be here today, is in fact the prime sponsor in the House of this program of educational television. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has been a long-time sponsor of such a program in the other body. So far as the success of this program is concerned, and the fact that we have reached this stage in it, we should keep in mind that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] has done a magnificent job. He has been constant, he has been sure in his own mind that this would be a program that would contribute so much to the education of our people and the education of our children so that they might become great leaders in this country. I pay him this tribute and I compliment him for the long, continuous, and ardu-

ous efforts he has made over the years in behalf of this program. The House bill as reported by the committee was the bill sponsored by him, and therefore he becomes one of the coauthors of this program and is entitled to a great deal of credit.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

(Mr. HEMPHILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, as we contemplate the conference report on the educational TV bill, Senate 205, I feel it my privilege, as well as my duty to call attention to the magnificent efforts made by my good friend, the able Representative of the Fourth District of Alabama, the Honorable KENNETH ROBERTS, one of the most active members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives.

He has the distinction of heading up one of the subcommittees, and while I am not privileged to be on that subcommittee, I have frequently attended meetings of his subcommittee because of the importance of the legislation he has been considering for our people all over the Nation. But it is in the field of educational TV that his work has been particularly outstanding this session of Congress.

Mr. ROBERTS has been a legislative pioneer in the field of educational television and the conference report we are considering at this time is a product of his efforts over the past 5 years.

The State of Alabama, whom KENNETH A. ROBERTS has the honor to represent has been one of the staunchest advocates of the medium, well recognizing the value in the field of teaching.

Congressman ROBERTS first introduced a bill for educational TV during the 85th Congress and has been continually endeavoring to obtain passage of a bill that would provide this medium to all States and thereby greatly increase our Nation's educational potential.

I wish to commend my esteemed colleague and friend from Alabama for his never ending faith that this distinguished body would some day enact a measure of this type.

It is with pride that I can say I have had the distinct pleasure of sitting with our colleague from Alabama on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and that I have never seen a more devoted individual toward the health and welfare of his fellow man. Mr. Speaker, for his efforts in assisting to bring about legislation that I am sure we all agree on will increase the standards of education in our country and provide specialized training where heretofore it was unavailable due to the limitations of personnel, I believe we should all commend KENNETH A. ROBERTS and express our thanks to him for a job well done.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I think that the committees in the House and in the other body share considerable glory at this time in a significant piece of legislation. It was characterized throughout the deliberations as a completely non-partisan matter. A great many members of the committee in both parties have made contributions to the preparation of this legislation.

I do want to join the chairman in taking particular cognizance of the work of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS]. The only regret I have in connection with this legislation is that the bill upon which we went to conference did not bear his name, because he has worked for a number of years to bring about the passage of this legislation, which will have a significant impact upon the improved educational opportunities of the American people.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the conferees unanimously agreed on this conference report. We feel we have a good program here and we commend it to the House.

Since I do not have any further requests for time, Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. MILLS]. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 78 I am not recorded. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the roll call be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is a typographical error in my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 16. On page 6148, the middle column, paragraph 3, line 11, the word "stable" should have been "stale."

The last sentence of that paragraph should read as follows:

Consequently, there existed a willingness to believe in the sincerity of Roosevelt and his colleagues that could not be erased, but recriminations became stale as hope grew in a fresh start with a spirit exuberantly expressed by new men who were untrammelled by the past.

I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee

on Government Operations may have until midnight Thursday, April 19, 1962, to file a report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

A PRAYER FOR PEACE BY THOMAS MERTON, HOLY WEEK 1962

(Mr. KOWALSKI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, as Easter approaches and our Nation contemplates the resumption of nuclear testing, I would like to take this occasion to offer a prayer for the preservation of mankind.

My prayer was written for this occasion by Thomas Merton, master of novices at the Abbey of Gethsemani, Trappist, Ky., and a member of the Cistercians of the Strict Observance. Brother Thomas Merton is the author of such enduring works as "Seven Storey Mountain," "Waters of Siloe," "Sign of Jonas," and "Bread in the Wilderness." His most recent work is a prose poem inspired by the bombing at Hiroshima, entitled "Original Child Bomb."

In a letter accompanying his prayer, he writes:

I feel very close to the people of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. No day goes by without my explicitly praying for the victims of the bomb in my mass. We have an enormous responsibility. I offer you my wholehearted encouragement in your efforts for peace and disarmament. Such efforts are a sacred duty.

In this prayer Brother Thomas expresses for me the anguish of man groping to control the monstrous weapons he has devised for the annihilation of civilian populations and the sorrow of man for the incalculable injury we and our adversaries inflict on all men and on their children for generations to come.

The world is at the crossroad. Ahead lies either the atomic crucifixion of the human race or a resurrection of faith in God's presence in man.

With unanimous consent, I will read Brother Thomas' prayer:

Almighty and merciful God, Father of all men, creator and ruler of the universe, lord of history, whose designs are inscrutable, whose glory is without blemish, whose compassion for the errors of men is inexhaustible, in Your will is our peace.

Mercifully hear this prayer which rises to You from the tumult and desperation of a world in which You are forgotten, in which Your name is not invoked, Your laws are derided and Your presence is ignored; because we do not know You, we have no peace.

From the heart of an eternal silence, You have watched the rise of empires and have seen the smoke of their downfall.

You have seen Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Greece, and Rome, once powerful, carried away like sand in the wind.

You have witnessed the implausible fury of 10,000 fratricidal wars, in which great powers have torn whole continents to shreds in the name of peace and justice.

And now our Nation itself stands in imminent danger of a war the like of which has never been seen. This Nation dedicated to

freedom, not to power, has obtained through freedom a power, it did not desire.

And seeking by that power to defend its freedom, it is enslaved by the processes and policies of power. Must we wage a war we do not desire, a war that can do us no good, and which our very hatred of war forces us to prepare?

A day of ominous decision has now dawned on this free nation. Armed with a titanic weapon, and convinced of our own right, we face a powerful adversary, armed with the same weapon, equally convinced that he is right.

In this moment of destiny, this moment we never foresaw, we cannot afford to fail. Our choice of peace or war may decide our judgment and publish it in an eternal record.

In this fatal moment of choice in which we might still begin the patient architecture of peace, we may also take the last step across the rim of chaos.

Save us then from our obsessions. Open our eyes, dissipate our confusions, teach us to understand ourselves and our adversary. Let us never forget that sins against the law of love are punished by loss of faith, and those without faith stop at no crime to achieve their ends.

Help us to be masters of the weapons that threaten to master us.

Help us to use our science for peace and plenty, not for war and destruction.

Show us how to use atomic power to bless our children's children, not to blight them.

Save us from the compulsion to follow our adversaries in all that we most hate, confirming them in their hatred and suspicion of us.

Resolve our inner contradictions, which now grow beyond belief and beyond bearing; they are at once a torment and a blessing: for if you had not left us the light of conscience, we would not have to endure them.

Teach us to be long suffering in anguish and insecurity.

Teach us to wait and trust. Grant light, grant strength and patience to all who work for peace—to this Congress, our President, our military forces, and our adversaries.

Grant us prudence in proportion to our power, wisdom in proportion to our science, humanness in proportion to our wealth and might, and bless our earnest will to help all races and peoples to travel in friendship with us along the road to justice, liberty, and lasting peace.

But grant us above all to see that our ways are not necessarily Your ways, that we cannot fully penetrate the mystery of Your designs, and that the very storm of power now raging on this earth reveals Your hidden will and Your inscrutable decision.

Grant us to see Your face in the lightning of this cosmic storm, O God of holiness, merciful to men, grant us to seek peace where it is truly found.

In Your will, O God, is our peace. Amen.

REQUIEM FOR A FREE PEOPLE

(Mr. ALGER (at the request of Mrs. MAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, listen carefully, my colleagues, are the bells tolling the death knell of the liberties of the individual in America and in the passing bringing us the whisper of despair for freedom for all mankind? The past week's events may prove to be the most tragic of our entire history for we have seen a President of the United States use, with a ruthlessness never before experienced, the awesome power of the Federal Government to coerce and intimidate private industry and to

arouse public suspicion and distrust by the people of respected business leaders.

In making these remarks I am neither defending nor criticizing the action of the steel companies in announcing an increase in price. There is a much larger question here, the question of to what lengths an ambitious Chief Executive will go in the use of power to achieve results he desires. In the past few days we have seen here in the United States an angry President Kennedy denouncing, without a hearing, the leaders of the steel industry. We have seen President Kennedy using the medium of television and his highly placed public relations experts to arouse public indignation against those with whom he was personally displeased. We have read news stories of private citizens and newspapermen being aroused in the dark hours of the night by the agents of the Federal Government to answer questions pertaining to news sources and stories which had appeared in the press. Are we, the citizens of this land of the free, now to expect the thunder of boots in the night, the knock at the door, the summons to appear to justify our actions whenever we say anything or do anything that does not meet with the approval of the President and the planners who surround him?

I warn those who may now support the President's high-handed methods and disregard of the rights of freemen because they are not directly concerned, that once this power to use the force of the Federal Government against any segment of society is established, then the freedom of all of us is in danger. Does labor truly expect that President Kennedy will be satisfied to pressure business and industry into complying with his plans without exerting that same pressure upon those who work in the mines, mills, and factories when they, too, may attempt to exercise their freedom? Recent history should show us that freedom once lost is most difficult to regain. And can there be any doubt that any man who once finds that he can bend the people to his will on an economic matter will not soon be tempted to try the same tactics to assure political control? Oh, America, will you awake before it is too late, or are we to lie sleeping, while the forces of dictatorship are seething in the dark recesses of the minds of those who do not trust the people to govern themselves?

While a long, tragic step toward the abolishment of our free society has been taken, there is yet hope that it is not too late for the people to convince President Kennedy that his disregard of the rights of freemen is the wrong course. There is a ray of hope in the reaction of the Nation's press in these last few days to what has taken place. Under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to include some of the articles and editorial comment.

In 1960 Candidate Kennedy made a great to-do over the image of the United States abroad. The following items from the U.S. News & World Report show what President Kennedy did to the American image in one short speech and a night of ill-advised action:

Theodore C. Sorensen, Kennedy aid, wrote the statement in which the President criticized leaders of the U.S. steel industry.

Observers from Europe, listening to President Kennedy's remarks on steel, commented that no leader in the most socialized country of Western Europe would think of delivering an attack of that kind on a private industry.

Correspondents for the Soviet news agency, attending the President's news conference, cabled that President Kennedy had pictured a little group of business executives as running the United States against the Nation's welfare.

The Washington Daily News raises the grave question of police-state tactics in the following editorial from the edition of April 16, 1962:

KNOCKS ON THE DOOR

One side-bar aspect of the uproar over the new canceled increase in steel prices has an ugly connotation.

In Philadelphia, an Associated Press reporter was routed out of bed at 3 a.m. Thursday by the FBI and an hour later two G-men were pounding on his door.

At 5 a.m. the same day, a Wall Street Journal reporter was awakened by the FBI.

In Wilmington, Del., the G-men were sitting on the doorstep when a Wilmington Evening Journal reporter got to work at 6:30 a.m.

All of these newsmen were questioned by the FBI about a statement each had got earlier in the week from the president of the Bethlehem Steel Corp., who was quoted as saying "there should not be any price rise." That's all.

The questions could have been asked the next day, in business hours. Or next week. The rush by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy smacked of hysteria. Knocks on the door, or phone calls, in the middle of the night by agents of the law are repugnant in a free country—especially for such questions. It reflects on our ablest enforcement agency.

The following news story from the Wall Street Journal, April 16, 1962, with the foreboding quotes from some of the President's aids, gives an indication of how business, industry, and labor will probably react to the steel question and indicates the fear with which a free society and free institutions will operate in the future so long as President Kennedy remains in the White House:

STEEL SEQUEL—BUSINESS, LABOR LIKELY TO SHY FROM CHALLENGE TO PRESIDENT'S POLICIES—FARM, MEDICAL LEGISLATION ALSO MAY GET PUSH FROM KENNEDY'S POWER DISPLAY—BUT VELVET GLOVE IS ON NOW

WASHINGTON.—Steel prices are back where they were last Monday. But not the steel industry, nor business generally nor labor, nor the Government.

President Kennedy is pulling his velvet glove back on—in supreme confidence everyone will keep vividly in mind his display of the iron fist.

"The President has come out of this stronger than if the affair had never happened," declares one of his chief lieutenants. "It has focused the attention of every businessman and labor leader on Kennedy's policy of wage-price stability. Everyone is going to be very reluctant to try to pull off what steel tried."

What the bulk of the steel industry tried, of course, was a 3½-percent average increase in its prices. The move began Tuesday night and appeared successful by Wednesday, but Mr. Kennedy's violent counterattack made use of almost every conceivable govern-